



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,161	05/10/1999	LAWRENCE CUI	OLAL1006.002	7164

23910 7590 02/12/2003

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/309,161

Applicant(s)

CUI ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 12/3/2002.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 2-14 have been added. Claims 1-14 is pending in the case.

Claims 1-2, and 14 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al, hereinafter Quinlan (Pat. # 6,397,253 B1, 5/28/02, filed on 10/6/98), in view of Wagner (Pat. # 6,085,224, 7/4/00, filed on 3/11/97), and further in view of McGee (Pat. # 6,393,468 B1, 5/21/02, filed on 3/13/98) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Objections

4. Appropriate corrections have been made to claim 1, therefore, its objection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Appropriate corrections have been made to claim 1, therefore, its 35 U.S.C. 112 lack of antecedent basis rejection has been withdrawn.

8. Claims 2, and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 2 recites “appending unique session id to any URL in the response page” L.5. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the appending of a session id to any URL. The session id is appended to all URLs not just any of the URLs.

9. Claim 10 recites “setting a lifetime for the unique session id” L.2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the setting of a lifetime for a session id. The lifetime is set for the session not for the session id.

10. Claim 11 recites “dropping the information from the cookie repository when the lifetime expires” L.2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the dropping of information from the cookie repository.

11. Claim 12 recites “determining whether the client browser has disabled cookies” L.2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the client browser having disabled cookies.

12. Claim 14 recites “storing that information in a repository on a proxy server” L.2-3. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the storage of removed information in a proxy server. It is unclear from reading the specification where the removed information is stored.

Art Unit: 2178

13. Claim 14 recites “appending and identifier to any link in the document” L.5. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the appending of a session id to any URL. The session id is appended to all URLs not just any of the URLs.

14. Claim 11 recites the limitation “the lifetime” in L.2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

15. Claims 2, and 5-8 recite the limitation “storing the information in a cookie” claim 2, L.3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous “information” mentioned in this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-9, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al, hereinafter Quinlan (Pat. # 6,397,253 B1, 5/28/02, filed on 10/6/98), in view of Wagner (Pat. # 6,085,224, 7/4/00, filed on 3/11/97), further in view of Langford (Pat. # 6,507,911 B1, 1/14/03, filed on 7/22/98), and further in view of McGee (Pat. # 6,393,468 B1, 5/21/02, filed on 3/13/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Quinlan discloses managing cookies by avoiding unnecessary detection of cookies, stored in web page headers and by coding session information into URL(s) (c.7,L.26-44).

Moreover, Quinlan discloses creating and specifying a new session id—URL—as a result of a browser request (c.6, L.27-67).

Moreover, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *stripping off any cookies set by an external web site from the response header of the response web page, and storing the cookies in a repository*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers (c.3,L.1-67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting and then storing it at a repository or storage location (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches the deletion and storage of data without user invocation (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Furthermore, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *appending the session id to all of the links embedded in the response page and sending the modified response page, with the new header*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). McGee discloses the appending of a user's login name or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (c.10,L.34-67, c.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2178

have stripped the cookies, and appended sent the web page to the requesting user, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and McGee discloses assure that only authorized users can access web pages (c.4,L.43-67).

Regarding independent claim 2, Quinlan discloses creating and specifying a new unique session id—URL—as a result of a browser request (c.6, L.27-67).

Moreover, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *removing any cookies from a response page for the request and storing the information in a cookie repository*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers (c.3,L.1-67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting and then storing it at a repository or storage location (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches the deletion and storage of data without user invocation (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Furthermore, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *appending the unique session id to any URL in the response page before sending the response page to the client browser*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). McGee discloses the appending of a user's login name or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (c.10,L.34-67, c.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and appended sent the web page to the requesting user, because Wagner teaches above,

Art Unit: 2178

the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and McGee discloses assure that only authorized users can access web pages (c.4,L.43-67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *determining whether the client browser can accept cookies*. However, Wagner discloses determining whether a browser accepts cookies, and if does not deleting those cookies from the HTTP headers (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Quinlan, and Wagner, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *checking the request for an existing session id before generating a unique session id*. However, Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting, storing it at a repository or storage location to be retrieved by a user at a later time (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches protecting data deleted by a user (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *encrypting the session id*. McGee discloses checking for an existing login name or session id, in a user's request, before generating unique session ids to be appended to links in a web page (c.10,L.34-

67, c.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and appended sent the web page to the requesting user, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and McGee discloses assure that only authorized users can access web pages (c.4,L.43-67).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *retrieving a cookie from the cookie repository corresponding to the existing session id*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting, storing it at a repository or storage location to be retrieved by a user at a later time (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches protecting data deleted by a user (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in a generated header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67, c.12,L.1-67).

Claim 8 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 7, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses the reception of a web page as a result of a user's request to an external web site server (c.11, L.36-c.12,L.67).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *determining whether the client browser has disabled cookies*. However, Wagner discloses determining whether a user has disabled cookies' reception in a browser (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Quinlan, and Wagner, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *receiving the request from the client browser to a proxy server, the proxy server hosting the cookie repository*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting, storing it at a repository or remote storage location to be retrieved by a user at a later time (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches protecting data deleted by a user (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Regarding independent claim 14, Quinlan discloses creating and specifying a new unique session id—URL—as a result of a browser request (c.6, L.27-67).

Moreover, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *removing information from a document and storing that information in a repository on a proxy server*. However, Wagner discloses the

deletion of cookies from web page headers (c.3,L.1-67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting and then storing it at a remote repository or storage location (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches the deletion and storage of data without user invocation (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Furthermore, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *appending an identifier to any link in the document and sending that document to the client*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). McGee discloses the appending of a user's login name to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (c.10,L.34-67, c.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and appended sent the web page to the requesting user, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and McGee discloses assure that only authorized users can access web pages (c.4,L.43-67).

18. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al, hereinafter Quinlan, in view of Wagner, further in view of Langford, further in view of McGee, and further in view of Olden (Pat. # 6,460,141 B1, 10/1/02, filed on 10/28/98).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses managing cookies by avoiding unnecessary detection of cookies, stored in web page headers and by coding session information into URL(s) (c.7,L.26-44). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *setting a lifetime for the*

Art Unit: 2178

unique session id. However, Olden teaches the setting of a maximum lifetime for a cookie containing a session id or user id (c.24,L.29-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Quinlan, Wagner, Langford, McGee and Olsen, because Olsen teaches above protecting a user from malicious attacks.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 2, Quinlan discloses managing cookies by avoiding unnecessary detection of cookies, stored in web page headers and by coding session information into URL(s) (c.7,L.26-44). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *dropping the information from the cookie repository when the lifetime expires*. However, Olden teaches the dropping of the use of a cookie once its lifetime expires (c.24,L.29-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Quinlan, Wagner, Langford, McGee and Olsen, because Olsen teaches above protecting a user from malicious attacks.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 12/3/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "Nowhere does Quinlan disclose the management of cookies" P.7,L.10-12) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Applicants submit that McGee does not teach the appending a session id to all the URLs embedded in a Web page (p.8,L.5-10). The Examiner disagrees, because McGee discloses the appending of a user's login name to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (c.10,L.34-67, c.11,L.56-67).

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Applicants submit that Wagner does not teach the newly added limitation of storing deleted cookies in a repository (p.7,L.21-24). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this limitation above at least in view of the newly found prior art.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2178

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, except formal After Final communications)

Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Application/Control Number: 09/309,161


Page 14

Art Unit: 2178

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

2/6/03


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY DIRECTOR